



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,020	09/29/2000	Steven M. Bennett	042390.P9236	3234
7590	05/31/2006		EXAMINER	
Thomas S Ferrill Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025			AZAD, ABUL K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/676,020	BENNETT, STEVEN M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ABUL K. AZAD	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on March 9, 2006.
2. Claims 1-3 and 5-23 are pending in this action. Claims 1, 15, 18 and 21 are amended.
3. The applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-23 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. For examiner's response to the applicant's arguments or comments, see the detailed discussion in the Response to the Arguments section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-13 and 15-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods et al. (US 6,510,417), in view of Kanevsky et al. (US 5,774,525).

As per claim 1, Woods teaches, "a system comprising":
"a user" (col. 6, lines 39-40);
"a module to identify the user" (col. 6, lines 59-60);

“a voice user interface to facilitate communications between the user and the system” (col. 6, lines 39-40);

“a database to store contextual information pertaining to the user” (col. 13, lines 1-2); and

“the system to use user-specific contextual information to dynamically change the voice user interface, wherein the voice user interface alters navigational options through the voice user interface that are presented to the user based upon environmental information at the location of the user” (col. 24, line 30 to col. 25, line 65).

Woods does not explicitly teach, “altering the security characteristics presented to the user by the voice user interface based upon the environment information at the location of the user”. However, Kanevsky teaches, “altering the security characteristics presented to the user by the voice user interface based upon the environment information at the location of the user” (col. 6, lines 48-59 and col. 9, lines 8-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Kanevsky’s teaching of altering security characteristics presented to the user based up on the environmental information at the location, in the invention of Woods because Kanevsky teaches to protect against eavesdroppers gain access to the service or facility (col. 2, lines 24-26).

As per claim 2, Woods teaches, “an identity of the user and current location of the user” (col. 24, line 30 to col. 25, line 65).

As per claim 3, Woods teaches, “wherein the user-specific contextual information comprises: an identity of the user; and a current task of the user” (col. 24, line 30 to col. 25, line 65).

As per claim 5, Woods teaches, “wherein the environmental information comprises channel characteristic of a communication device that the user uses to communicate between the user and the system” (col. 13, lines 17-29).

As per claim 7, Woods teaches, “a computer program to dynamically generate the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information to the user” (col. 5, lines 45-58).

As per claim 8, Woods teaches, “wherein the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information is organized based upon the user-specific contextual information” (col. 6, lines 59-67).

As per claim 9, Woods teaches, “wherein the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information is organized based upon environmental information” (col. 13, lines 17-39).

As per claim 10, Woods teaches, “wherein the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information is organized based upon the sensitivity of the information being delivered to the user” (col. 33, lines 32-58).

As per claim 11, Woods teaches, “a telephony interface device capable of communicating to the user in a human voice” (col. 6, lines 39-40).

As per claim 12, Woods teaches, “a module to generate a grammar file to enhance the ability of the system to comprehend communications between the user and the system” (col. 9, lines 38-52).

As per claim 13, Woods teaches, "wherein the environmental information is communicated to the system by the user" (col. 25, lines 15-18).

As claim 15, Woods teaches, "a method comprising":

"using user-specific contextual information to change a voice user interface and using environmental information to change the voice user interface" (col. 24, line 30 to col. 25, line 65); and

Woods does not explicitly teach, "altering the security characteristics presented to the user by the voice user interface based upon the environment information at the location of the user". However, Kanevsky teaches, "altering the security characteristics presented to the user by the voice user interface based upon the environment information at the location of the user" (col. 6, lines 48-59 and col. 9, lines 8-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Kanevsky's teaching of altering security characteristics presented to the user based up on the environmental information at the location, in the invention of Woods because Kanevsky teaches to protect against eavesdroppers gain access to the service or facility (col. 2, lines 24-26).

As per claims 18 and 21, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 15.

As per claims 16,19 and 22, Woods teaches, "generating the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information to the user based upon the user-specific contextual information" (col. 6, lines 59-67).

As per claims 17, 20 and 23, Woods teaches, "generating the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information to the user based upon environmental information" (col. 13, lines 17-39).

6. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods et al. (US 6,510,417) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Goldberg et al. (US 5,970,446).

Woods does not explicitly teach environmental information is determined by the audio scene information at the location. However, Goldberg teaches environmental information is determined by the audio scene information at the location (Fig. 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Goldberg's teaching of determining environmental information in the invention of Woods because Goldberg teaches his invention provide a highest percent of correct speech recognition by selecting the correct model using audio scene information of the location (col. 5, lines 1-6).

Response to Arguments

7. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, motivation found in the Kanevsky reference.

8. In response to applicant's argument that Kanevsky is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kanevsky solve a particular problem of security level.

9. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Abul K. Azad** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7599**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richemond Dorvil**, can be reached at **(571) 272-7602**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to: **(571) 273-8300**.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to **401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA-22314** (Customer Service Window).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 27, 2006



Abul K. Azad
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2626